APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,156	01/05/2000	Edward L Bayiates	M0995/7002/PJG/AR	1311

26339   7590   05/10/2002

HUTCHINS, WHEELER & DITTMAR
101 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/478,156		BAYIATES, EDWARD L	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Cam Y T Truong		2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 February 2002</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) *10-24, 28-49* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 25-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-19 and 25-27 in Paper

No. 12 is acknowledged. Claims 1-49 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-11, 15-19, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nagral et al (USP 6260044) in view of Stiegemeier et al (USP

6192381).

As to claims 1, 17, and 19, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and

format data indicating the manner in which the .....represented" as (col. 2, lines 35-43;

col. 5, lines 25-35);

"storing the identified content data" as (col. 5, lines 60-65).

Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "identifying at least some of the

content data in accordance with a template". However, Stiegemeier teaches the above

claimed limitation in col. 10, lines 30-55. It would have been obvious to a person of an

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's

teaching of retrieved document include a code which identifies the appropriate template

that will provide the format for displaying document to Nagral 's system in order to display different type of data in proper format or location on screen following user's desire.

As to claim 2, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "normalizing the data representing the visual form of data" as most application transform data to a visual form as either a vector image or a bit map image for display on a display device. This visual form is captured into a database 64 in the information storage and retrieval system in a format defined by the operating system 54 of the general purpose computer (col. 5, lines 40, lines 56).

As to claim 3, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the data is normalized .....form of data" as (col. 5, lines 40-46).

As to claim 4, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized......at least two coordinate systems" as (col. 5, lines 20-40) , "wherein normalizing the data ....into a common coordinate system" as (col. 21, lines 10-30).

As to claim 5, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the common coordiate......visual form of data " as (col. 22, lines 1-10).

As to claim 6, Nagral disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 4, except the claimed limitation "the template........on the common coordinate system". However, Stiegemeier teaches that extract the data from the document and format data in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data. The instruction that a template may use to define a display including data location (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of extract the data from the document and format data in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code, which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data. The instruction that a template may use to define a display, which include data location to Nagral's system in order to display different type of data in proper format or location on screen following user's desire.

As to claim 7, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the data representing the visual form of data comprises.....outputting ....by a printer" as (col. 22, lines 1-10; col. 6, lines 1-10).

As to claim 8, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "operating system layer.....Windows metafile" as (col. 19, lines 55-60).

As to claim 9, Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "the template includes

.....from the received data". However, Stiegemeier teaches above claimed limitation in

col. 11, lines 15-40.

As to claim 10, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data

.....by the coordinate system" as (col. 5, lines 20-40). Nagral fails to teach the claimed

limitation "the extraction instruction includes ....on coordinate system". However,

Stiegemeier teaches the above claimed limitation col. 11, lines 1-15.

As to claim 11, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a

direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as (col. 5, lines 20-40);

"wherein identifying at least some of.......content data in the direction" as (col. 3,

lines 15-20; col. 3, lines 44-50); "a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions" as (col.

5, lines 35-40).

Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes...a

reference marker". However, Siegemeier teaches the above claimed limitation in col.

11, lines 1-30.

As to claim 15, Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "the received data

further represents a plurality of visual forms of data". However, Nagral teaches that

data 56 is generally in the form of a vector image or reports (col. 5, lines 60-67; col. 6,

lines 15-25).

As to claim 16, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation "storing the identified content data ....: storing .....visual forms of data" as (col. 5, lines 50-67).

As to claims 18, Nagral teaches the claimed limitation:

"a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data .....visually represented" as (col. 2, lines 35-43; col. 5, lines 25-35);

"a storage media that stores the identified content data" as (col. 5, lines 60-65);

Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "a processor .....a template".

However, Stiegemeier teaches the above claimed limitation in col. 10, lines 30-55. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of retrieved document include a code which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying document. This information shows that the system should include a processor in order to identify the appropriate template to Nagral 's system in order to display different type of data in proper format or location on screen following user's desire.

As claims 25, 26 and 27, Nagral teaches the same claimed limitation in claim 1, "initiating performing ....content data" as (col. 5, lines 60-65).

4.   Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nagral et al (USP 6260044) in view of Stiegemeier and further in view of Maejima et al

(USP 5327568).

As to claim 12, Nagral teaches the claimed limitations:

"displaying a sample ...data" as (col. 6, lines 28-35);

"receiving data from a user....data" as (col. 21, lines 15-25).

Nagral fails to teaches the claimed limitation "forming the extraction instruction.....by the

user". However, Maejima teaches that extracting the instruction name from the

instruction name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input

pin position coordinate sections 825 (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would

have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was

made to apply Maejima teaching of instruction name from the instruction name section

in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate

sections 825 to Nagral's system and Stiegemeier's system in order to display data in

proper format following user's desire.

As to claim 13, Nagral fails to teaches the claimed limitation "storing the

extraction instruction". However, Maejima teaches that the instruction template and the

information of input and output data of the instructions are previously stored in the file.

This information show that all of instruction template is stored in file including extraction

information. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Maejima's teaching of storing instruction template

to Nagral's system and Stiegemeier's system in order to form a format data for

displaying.

As to claim 14, Nagral fails to teach the claimed limitation "storing the

extraction.....visual form of data". However, Nagral teaches that creating information

which has a visual form that may be displayed or printed. This visual form is captured

into a database 64 in the information storage and retrieval system in a format defined by

the operating system. This information shows that this visual form is represented as a

extraction instruction in association with data obviously. It would have been obvious to

a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Nagral's teaching of creating information which has a visual form that may be displayed

or printed. This visual form is captured into a database 64 in the information storage

and retrieval system in a format defined by the operating system in order to return a

correct result to user's request.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Krishna et al (USP 6055522).

Contact Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-

1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703-305-4393). The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-746-7239 (formal

communications intended for entry), or: (703)-746-7240 (informal communication

labeled PROPOSED or DRAFT).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-

3900).

Cam-Y Truong

4/16/02

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100